THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VI. JUNE, 1926. No. 6.

Some Notes on Ephesus.

DR. E. G. SIHLER, Mount Vernon, N. Y.

Perfecit opus suum Phidias, etiamsi non vendidit.
(Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, II, 33.)

I do not, here and now, propose to repeat what may be found in the great standard series of Pauly-Wissowa *sub verbo* "Ephesos." Only the other day there appeared a new book, *Paul of Tarsus,* by Dr. T. R. Glover, of Cambridge, England, which I have not yet had time to examine. After the Light of the World His greatest apostle seems to be the greatest figure, still, among all the children of men, a figure steadily growing with time, and growing, too, with the undeniable decadence in the world's estimate of secular "greatness." Well, I have not yet had the leisure to examine this work and compare it with Conybeare and Howson or Lewin. At this moment, too, I have turned over some pages in Neander's *Pflanzung und Leitung,* fourth edition (Hamburg, Perthes, 1847). Much of it is reply or critique of Baur and his Tuebingen School. How much of that "critical" school was wild conjecture, foisting subjective conceptions into historical construction or reconstruction, interpreting speculative conjecture into the broken data of actually available tradition!

Sir William Ramsay (whom I have the honor to know by correspondence and scholar's exchange of work) in 1911 published a little book, *The First Christian Century,* notes on Dr. Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1911), which I here desire heartily to commend to the readers of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY; but I must limit myself to a single *passus* (p. 13): "But Manen, or even Baur, sitting in judgment on Paul, is a mole attempting to estimate the size of a colossus, or the strength of a lion, or the swiftness of an eagle in the air." No more of this.

One thing I have noticed in the efforts of the higher critics

(none common or low, of course): they operate over and over again with the *argumentum e silentio,* as Lightfoot demonstrated over and over again in his *Supernatural Religion* (1889). But to come nearer to my present theme: I will write down two things which seem to gain on me with age: 1) Paul never *seems* to have established a Christian congregation at Tarsus, his native city. If not, why not? (A historical question.) 2) Why did not Paul ever visit Alexandria, the greatest Jewish center outside of Jerusalem?

I would like to ask (I wish Luke could tell me), How many synagogs did the Diaspora have at Ephesus?* In the time of Seneca and St. Paul, if we may trust Seneca (who knew Ephesus merely by reputation), Alexandria and Ephesus (outside of Rome) were the most populous cities in the Roman Empire. *"Ephesum aut Alexandriam aut siquod est etiamnunc frequentius incolis."* (*Ep.,* 102, 21.) By an edict of Dolabella (son-in-law of Cicero and partisan of the Caesarian faction), 44—43 B. C., the Jews of Ephesus, in consequence of an official request, transmitted from Hyrcanus, high priest and ethnarch at Jerusalem, were declared immune from bearing arms and marching and permitted to maintain their own diet: all based on the Jewish laws of the Sabbath; they were also to be entitled to the *"ἀφαιρέματα* on account of the sacrifices," all referred to by the Roman proconsul as being in consonance with the precedent of former proconsuls (one of whom had been Cicero's own brother, Quintus C.). (Josephus, *Antiqq.,* XIV, 10. 12.) A further statement of Josephus (*l. c.,* § 13) goes back to the year 49 B. C., the beginning of the Civil War, when the Consul L. Lentulus granted a similar immunity *pro tribunali* to the "Jewish citizens of the Romans" (*i. e.,* Jews at Ephesus who are Roman citizens), "who hold the Jewish worship and practise it at Ephesus." The edict is addressed to the magistrates of the Ephesians and "To the Council and the People thereof" and covers the Jews in Asia (*i. e.,* in all the province, Ephesus being the capital of that province, which *before* the acquisition of Egypt, in 30 B. C., was considered the richest province in the Roman Empire. (Cf. Cicero's *De Lege Manilia.*) The Jews in these and other official edicts and other documents are presented as a separate and distinct *ἔθνος* or nationality, connected with Jerusalem and the high priest there.

In Josephus's *Antiquities* (XIV, 10. 25) we have, further,

* From Acts it seems there was but one.

a *psephisma,* a resolution of the citizen body, in the prytaneship of Menophilos, enacted, or passed, on the first day of the month Artemisios, the month specially named so in honor of the tutelary goddess Artemis (Diana) of the great city, recognizing the immunities of the Jews on account of their Sabbath and forbidding the imposition of fines upon them on this account. Similar privileges were reaffirmed by the proconsul Julius Antonius in meeting a petition of Jews in Asia when he held court in Ephesus on the Ides of February (the 13th), as granted them by Augustus and Agrippa before, particularly in the transmission of "sacred funds to Jerusalem." (Josephus, *l. c.,* XVI, 6. 7.)

From this, then, let us turn to the *Inscriptiones* and other data dug up under the supervision of J. T. Wood, F. S. A., largely through financial subvention furnished by the trustees of the British Museum, during the years 1863 to 1875. The great temple of Artemis (*τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον*) was always the center and chief concern of this great city. According to Wood's computation and excavations, the space enclosed by the city wall of the Augustan (and so the Apostolic) Age, was a surface of some 1,027 acres. The little Selinus, tributary to the Kaystros, flowed hard by the Artemision. It was only *after* Alexander's death, 323 B. C., that the city was surrounded by a wall.

The temple was seven stadia from the city proper. The columns of the last temple were of syenite, from Upper Egypt. The stadium, scene of athletic games, was probably of the Augustan Age. The Great Theater (referred to by Luke, Acts 19, 29. 31), according to Wood's measurements, could seat 24,500 persons. In one large sarcophagus there were found by Mr. Wood four skeletons, together with four dishes and four small vases. Wood was puzzled as to what these designs might be, for they seem to have been of the Christian, post-Constantinian Era. He saw the Christian monogram $A \text{✠} \Omega$ carved upon the white marble lid. I will append here what any one may see in the museums of Italy, *viz.,* that the ancient pagan sarcophagi are generally ornamented with rams' or steers' skulls at the corners, with festoons of fruits and flowers. What do these symbolize in memorials of the dead? Is it not perhaps this: "Enjoy life while you may"?

But we must limit ourselves to the most significant matters.

The peristyle of the temple had about one hundred pillars of the Ionic order, and the roof was covered with huge marble tiles. "St. Paul," says Wood (p. 272), "during his three years' sojourn

at Ephesus, doubtless often gazed upon it with admiration, at the same time that he deplored its consecration to the worship of a heathen goddess." It was one of the Seven Wonders of the World. The island Ortygia, near by, was claimed as the place where Leto finally terminated her pangs by the birth of Apollo and Artemis. (Strabo, 639.) How the legends of Delos fitted these myths I know not. It does seem that Ephesus, never directly on the strand of the Aegean, was gradually built up around the sanctuary of Artemis. The one of St. Paul's time was the *third* in order. Each new structure was always built on the same spot, and within the same *temenos,* or small enclosure. The temple set on fire by Herostratos in the night of the birth of Alexander the Great had been the second one. This third one — let us call it that of St. Paul's time — was built with extraordinary efforts, the citizens contributing heavily from their private estates and the jewelry of the women, says Strabo (640), the *psephismata,* or people's resolutions, attesting this even in Strabo's time. Several decades were spent in its construction. Dinocrates, who planned the construction of Alexandria on the coast of Egypt (332 B. C. and following years), was the chief architect. (Strabo, 641.)

The gradual accumulation of anathemata, or sacred gifts, by private persons, by potentates, and by entire communities must have been enormous. The great altar was by Praxiteles. The priests, says Strabo, were eunuchs, called Megalobyzoi. I need not say that the greater temples of the Greeks (quite like the Italian churches of the *Medio Evo* and the Renaissance, in time became, in a way, museums of art. Associated with these eunuch priests were Ephesian virgins. A word as to the right of asylum, or sanctuary, enjoyed by the temple: Strabo intimates that some of the usages were less guarded in his day (the Augustan Age) than formerly, but that the right of asylum was rigorously preserved. Alexander had granted a stadium (one-eighth of a mile) around the temple; Mithridates a little more. Antony doubled this, so as to take even the contiguous edge of the city, which excess Augustus canceled, as it protected malefactors. The clear inference for us is that the temple was well set off from the city. In the time of Augustus it received its separate circumvallation (or *peribolos*).

Now, the temple of Augustus, the *Σεβαστεῖον,* or *Augusteum,* was near to the Artemisium. One sees how judiciously the site and scene of emperor-worship was virtually associated with the Great God cult.

I now transcribe and translate from Wood's Inscription No. 1 of these two temples. It is bilingual. "The Imperator" (reproduced in Greek as *Αὐτοκράτωρ*) "Caesar Augustus, *son of the Divus* [Caesar], consul for the XIIth time, Tribunus Plebis for the eighteenth year, Pontifex Maximus, provided for the building of the wall around the sanctuary [of Artemis] from the *religious revenue* of the goddess." Whether this revenue was from endowment and investment or from regular gifts of worshipers, we do not know. Augustus also provided for "sacred pillars of the roads and watercourses for Artemis." The watercourse has a width of fifteen cubits.

The "Ephesia" were an all-Ionic periodical celebration (in the time of Demetrius and Seleucus), and public announcements of special importance were then made. (No. 7: Inscriptions from the Temple of Diana.) It seems that the men or magistrates entrusted with public works and their repair were called (very frequently in the Inscr.) *νεωποιοί*, or *νεωποιαί*, from *νεωποιής*. These, too, were entrusted with the Inscription recording the specific honors voted to a non-Ephesian, together with enrolment as a citizen in a specific tribe and one thousand (*χιλιαστύς*), which Inscriptions it seems were immersed or otherwise preserved in the great temple. These curators of public works we might, in English, designate as temple-wardens. In the theater there were celebrated Dionysia. We may conceive them as dramatic exhibitions, called by the same name as at Athens. Sometimes Ephesus, too, honored a man by placing a wreath on his head in the temenos of Artemis and Augustus.

The great shrine or shrines were sometimes simply designated as "of Asia." (No. 2 of Inscr. from the site of the temple.)

(To be concluded.)

Exposition of the Sedes Doctrinae of the Lord's Supper.

Rev. W. J. Schroeder, Bonduel, Wis.

(Continued.)

The all-important part of this first section of the words of institution is now before us, and a correct understanding of their true, intended meaning is essential to a God-pleasing celebration of the Sacrament. The Lord expressly tells His disciples what He gives them, and what they, therefore, shall receive, with the

bread. "And [He] said," *καὶ εἶπεν*, thus the apostle proceeds, likewise Matthew and Mark, while Luke uses the participle: He gave them the bread "saying," *λέγων*, which shows that Jesus did not first give the bread to His disciples and then add the words which follow in the record in explanation thereof, but that the giving and the speaking was done simultaneously. He extended the bread to them, saying, "Take, eat," *λάβετε, φάγετε*, as we read in the records of Paul, Matthew, and Mark; Luke omits these words. The Lord commands His disciples to take and to eat what He extends to them, and that with the mouths of their body. They were to take it, not in a spiritual manner, by faith, but in a natural manner, be it first with the hand, then with the mouth of their body, or be it directly, immediately, with the mouth, so that, as regards the mode of receiving the element, it is immaterial whether the administrant convey it directly to the mouth of the communicant or the latter take it in hand from the former and complete the action himself. And the disciples were to eat the bread; they were not to adore, revere, worship, or idolize it, but they were to eat it, and that likewise not spiritually, by faith, but orally; and accordingly it is important for us to note, with reference to our celebration of the Eucharist, that oral, or bodily, eating is an essential part of it.

And what was it that the Lord gave to His disciples and which they were to take and eat? "This is My body," said the Lord, as we find it stated harmoniously in all four records, *Τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα*. These words are clear and simple; it is obvious from them that the Lord commands His disciples to take and to eat His body. Let us analyze this simple sentence: *This* is the subject; *is My body* is the complete, or logical, predicate; or *My body* is the complement of the verb *is* or the predicate of the sentence, and *is* is the copula, which tells of the subject *This*, what it is, *viz.*, My, *i. e.*, the Lord's, body. The subject *This* is the singular and the neuter gender of the same demonstrative pronoun. Now what does the pronoun *This* relate to? Some would have it relate to the foregoing word, bread. By substituting *This bread* for *This*, which would, in such case, be necessary, the sentence would read: This bread is My body. This is not materially incorrect; for what the Lord held in His hand and commanded His disciples to take and to eat was the bread which He had blessed and broken. However, the whole logico-grammatical construction stands in opposition to such an analysis, or explanation, of the subject *This*. The pronoun *This* relates not to the preceding, but

to the succeeding words. The subject of the sentence is qualified by the predicate. The Lord wishes to say: That which I extend and give to you, that which you are to take and eat, is My body. This is a common and comprehensible mode of speech. When one says, *e. g.*, "This is a book," every one understands the meaning of these words to be, This which you see, this article, is a book. Just so in the words of institution: The Lord says, This which you shall take and eat is My body. He does not refer to the bread in these words. He does not thereby deny that the bread is truly present, and that it, too, is to be taken and eaten by the disciples. It was merely unnecessary to direct their attention to this; for the disciples saw and tasted the bread. The Lord did find it necessary, however, to emphasize that what He gave them and what they were to take and eat with the bread was His body. This He does when He says: "This is My body."

That this is the correct explanation of the pronoun *This* in the sentence before us is apparent also from the fact that, whenever in Scripture-passages pertaining to the Eucharist the term which designates the earthly element forms the subject of the sentence, we then notice a change in the predicate. Luke and Paul, *e. g.*, in reporting the institution of the second element, specifically call the earthly element "this cup"; however, they do not now proceed thus: This cup is My blood, but they write as follows: "This cup is the new testament in My blood." And in 1 Cor. 10, 16 the apostle does not say, The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the body of Christ? He writes thus: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the *communion* of the body of Christ?" The sacramental bread is the communion of the body of Christ; together with the bread the communicant receives Christ's body. Dr. Graebner writes: "It is not a matter of arbitrary choice how we would refer the pronoun. Here as elsewhere the context must decide. According to the context these words, 'This is My body,' were spoken in the course of a continuous action, of which Christ said, *Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, 'This do.' In the act of giving to His disciples the bread which He had blessed, Jesus said, 'Take, eat, this is My body.' All this must be taken together to determine the meaning of *τοῦτο*. What Jesus would say is, *This which I give you* to eat as I give you this consecrated bread is My body. That He gave them bread the disciples saw and thus knew without being told. Hence Jesus tells them that

with the sacramental bread He gave them His body: *Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου.*" (*Theol. Quarterly,* Vol. 5, p. 161 sq.)

"This is My body," thus says the Lord. He says clearly and plainly of that which He gave His disciples to eat that it is His body. Clearer and plainer and simpler words than are contained in this sentence cannot be found. The proponents of a false doctrine of the Eucharist realize this, and therefore they seek to establish their doctrine from other Scripture-passages and then interpret and explain the actual words of institution accordingly. Consequently all sorts of methods have been applied in an endeavor to give these words a figurative meaning. Some would find a trope, or figure, in the subject of the sentence; others would find one in the predicate; still others look for it in the verb or copula. As to the latter, we may state without reluctance or hesitation that *is* in all languages means *is,* nothing else, nothing more, nor less. *E. g.,* in the sentence, "The seed is the Word of God," Luke 8, 11, which actually contains a figure, the figure is not contained in the verb *is,* and the sentence is not to be explained thus: The seed *signifies* the Word of God, but it is to be explained thus: The seed *is, is actually,* the Word of God. The figure in this sentence is in the subject, the seed. The seed of which the Lord speaks is not natural seed, such as is sown into the ground, but figurative seed, and this seed *is* His Word. The matter becomes still clearer when the predicate contains a metaphor, or figure. In the sentences, "Christ is the Vine," "Christ is the Rock," the meaning is not that Christ signifies the vine or the rock; no, the meaning is that Christ is truly the Vine, the Rock; indeed, not a natural vine, such as grows in the vineyard, but the true spiritual Vine; not a natural rock, but the true spiritual Rock, from which flows the Water of Life. When Christ says, "I am the Good Shepherd," "I am the Way," "I am the Door," it would be nothing short of belittling and dishonoring Him to explain His sayings to mean that He merely signifies the Good Shepherd, the way, the door; for He actually and truly is all this. The predicate is merely not to be understood in its native, but in a figurative sense. Thus it is clear that a figure, or trope, is never in the word *is.* But even if an example could be found in which *is* means *signifies,* it would not prove that such is the case in the words of institution. Moreover, in every figurative form of speech there must be some point of comparison, a *tertium comparationis.* But where is the point of comparison in the words in question? All that can be said is that there is none. The burden of proof

that the words of institution are to be explained and interpreted figuratively really rests upon those who give them a figurative meaning. To this day, however, such proof has been conspicuous by its absence. Until convincing proof to the contrary has been offered, — and we have reason to doubt the possibility thereof, — we shall cling to the meaning, to the explanation, as stated: "This *is truly* My body." — "In offering the physical elements to the disciples," thus Dr. Dau writes, "the Lord employs the *locutio exhibitiva,* common to every language of men: He names that which is not seen while giving that which is seen. ('Here are your spices,' says the grocer delivering the package containing them.) The *locutio exhibitiva,* except when used by a jester or dishonest person, always states a fact. The bread in the Eucharist *is* the body of Christ. . . . The relation [of the elements to one another] is expressed in 1 Cor. 10, 16. 17 by *koinonia,* "communion." *Koinonia* declares a communion of the bread with the body of Christ." (*I. S. B. E.,* Vol. 3, p. 1927.)

Nor do we cling to the stated meaning of the words in question as a matter of arbitrary choice. Scripture compels us to do so; for the stated meaning is the simple, proper, and apparent meaning of the words. And surely, the exposition of these words is governed by the same law of Bible exegesis applicable to the entire sacred Record, *viz.,* that every word and statement of Scripture must be understood in its proper and native sense unless a plain and urgent reason compels the adoption of a figurative interpretation. Regarding the words of institution, however, a reason for doing this is completely lacking; there is no indication in the record that these words are to be understood figuratively. Again, the very fact that the words of institution of the Eucharist are the expression of the Lord's last will, or testament, not only forbids the use of figurative language on the part of the Lord, it also precludes any right or option on the part of man to turn, or twist, or interpret the words as he will, but makes it imperative that he accept them in their plain, simple, literal meaning, just as they read. Even the testament of man is interpreted and executed strictly according to the proper and native meaning of the words and specifications set forth therein. For instance, it is stated in the testament of a deceased father that the estate shall be divided between the two sons in this way, that the one son, John, is to receive the farm and the other son, Henry, the cash and the personal property as the equivalent of the real estate. If, in such a case, the latter were to contest the will and say, It is true, according to the simple words of the

document, Brother John is to receive the farm; however, this was not father's meaning; he meant to say that John is to receive a picture of the farm, would not a fair judge, in such an event, be apt to lose his equilibrium and his mental poise, and would he not be justified in censuring the contestant most severely? If the word: "Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto" (Gal. 3, 15), applies, as it surely does, to the will, or testament, of man, it applies with triple force to the words of institution of the Eucharist, the last will, or testament, of the Lord. Furthermore, the words of institution are the *sedes doctrinae* of the Eucharist, the *loci classici* of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Now, if one would be justified in giving these clear passages of Scripture a figurative meaning merely because their simple import lies beyond the grasp of human reason, one would be justified to do so in every other instance with regard to the *loci classici* of any other doctrine, and the result would be that reason would sit upon the entire sacred Volume as its master and superior, and thus not a single revealed doctrine could be retained. God forbid, therefore, that we ever waver in our firm conviction that the true, intended meaning of the words in question is and only can be: "This *is,*" *is truly,* "My body."

The question confronting us now, then, is: Was the bread changed into the body of Christ? And again we must answer most emphatically, No! No transubstantiation took place. When the Lord said, "Take, eat; this is My body," the meaning of His words was not: The bread is no longer bread, but has been changed into My body; no, the meaning of His words was: That which I give you in and with the bread is My body. When one says to another in handing him a glass of water, "This is water," he does not mean to say that the tumbler is no longer a tumbler, but that it has been transformed into water; but this is what he means to say: In this tumbler I am giving you water. Again, referring to Christ and saying, God is man, we do not wish to say, that God has been transformed into man, but that God is man by virtue or reason of the union of the divine and human natures. And as in this case the divinity remains divinity and the humanity remains humanity, each retaining its own nature, just so in the Eucharist the bread remains bread and Christ's body remains the body of Christ, each retaining its own nature, however, by virtue or reason of the sacramental union of the elements, in this manner, that the earthly element is not present without the heavenly element

in the Lord's Supper, and *vice versa*. Therefore the apostle still calls the bread *bread after* the consecration. 1 Cor. 10, 16.

Again, the meaning of Christ's words, "This is My body," is not that His body was locally imbedded in the bread. The idea of a so-called impanation must be rejected. Neither were the bread and Christ's body consubstantiated, so that the two elements were transformed into a third substance. No; the bread was the carrier of the Lord's body. And as the vehicle and that which it carries are two things, just so the bread and Jesus' body remained two distinct elements.

The only true interpretation and explanation of these first words of institution, then, is that the disciples were to take and eat, and did take and eat, Christ's true body in, with, and under the bread. How that was possible we shall not attempt to determine and explain. Indeed, as Dr. Dau writes, "all we can assert is that in a manner incomprehensible to us the body of the Lord is in a sacramental union with the eucharistic bread and that the eating in the Eucharist is of a peculiar kind. It differs from mere natural eating of common food and also from spiritual eating. In natural eating there would be only bread and not also the body of the Lord; in spiritual eating there would be only the merits of the Redeemer and not also bread. In the sacramental eating, however, both the bread and the body of Christ are sacramentally received, the earthly element in a natural, the heavenly in a supernatural, undefinable manner, both, however, orally and both by every communicant. For according to 1 Cor. 11, 29 also the unworthy communicant receives the Lord's body, and that for his judgment, not discerning it." (*I. S. B. E.*, Vol. 3, p. 1927.)

The words of the first section of Paul's account of the institution which remain to be considered are the following: (This is My body) "which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of Me," *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.* The corresponding words of Luke are the same, with the exception that in his account we find the term "given" (*διδόμενον*) instead of "broken" for you. Matthew and Mark add nothing to the words, "This is My body." Now, what is the import of the Lord's words when He (only according to some texts) says with reference to His body: "which is broken for you"? The exegetes of the Reformed Church interpret also these words metaphorically. They hold that Jesus there alluded to His painful death on the cross. However, the fact that Christ's body was not to be, and therefore was not, broken on the cross stands in oppo-

sition to this explanation. John 19, 33. 36. Bengel, undoubtedly, hit the mark when he said that we have before us in these words a *locutio concisa, "hoc sensu: Quod pro vobis datur et vobis frangitur."* In the Eucharist, Christ's body is broken for us; in and with the bread, which is broken, or distributed, the body of Christ is broken, or distributed, for our benefit and good. So close and intimate is the sacramental union of the bread and the body of Christ that, inasmuch as the bread is broken, or distributed, in the Eucharist, we may rightfully speak of a simultaneous breaking, or distribution, of Christ's body. Luther also explains the words of Paul as referring to the "breaking or distribution over table." As regards the words of Luke, "which is given for you," the Lord assures His disciples that He gives them His body, which is given into death for them, for their spiritual benefit and welfare. — "This do in remembrance of Me," says the Lord. He commands His disciples to do that which they have seen Him do: they shall take bread, bless, or consecrate, it, break, or distribute, it, take and eat it, and the Lord will then always do as He did at the institution, *i. e.,* give them His body in and with the bread. The words, "This do in remembrance of Me," show that the Lord instituted the Eucharist for His Church of all times. The Christians shall celebrate it repeatedly, shall celebrate it, as the apostle says in the 26th verse, "till He [the Lord] come," *i. e.,* till He comes at the end of days to execute judgment. The Reformed exegetes would find evidence also in these words that their figurative interpretation of the words of institution is sound. They argue thus: The Lord commands us to celebrate His Supper "in remembrance" of Him; we shall, when celebrating it, remind ourselves of, recall to our memory, the Lord. This implies that the Lord, or the Lord's body, is not truly present in the Eucharist; for one can remember, recall to memory, only something *absent.* The conclusion which they draw is based upon a faulty conception of the words "in remembrance of Me." The import of these words is not that by means of the celebration of the Eucharist we are to remember the Lord, but that the *Holy Supper itself,* inasmuch as we receive the Lord's body therein, *reminds us* of the Lord. Nor is it true that one can be reminded of, remember, recall to memory, only something *absent.* How often does Scripture admonish us to remember the Lord! How often do we beseech the Lord to remember us! Ps. 9, 12 we read: "When He maketh inquisition for blood, He remembereth them; He forgetteth not the cry of the humble." Prov. 3, 6 it is written: "In all thy ways acknowl-

edge [*i. e.*, remember] Him, and He shall direct thy paths." Would it not be folly to conclude therefrom that the Lord and His believers are separated, and that contrary to Is. 41, 10, where the Lord says: "Fear thou not; for *I am with thee"?* The fact that the Eucharist is also a memorial supper implies that that of which we are to be reminded is *invisible;* but it does not imply that it is also *distant.* The Lord rather says expressly, Ex. 20, 24, "In all places where I record My name *I will come unto thee,* and I will bless thee." The correct explanation of the words in question can only be that the Lord therein indicates for what purpose we are to celebrate His Holy Supper. It shall be done in (*eis*), unto, remembrance of Him. The eating of His body and the drinking of His blood shall remind us of the Lord, recall to our memory that Jesus, as our Substitute, in our place and stead, gave His body into death and shed His blood for the forgiveness of our sins. Giving the communicants the ransom-money paid for their redemption, the Lord assures them of, seals unto them, the forgiveness of sins. Receiving this ransom-money and believing, the communicants are powerfully reminded of Christ's vicarious suffering and death on the cross for the remission of their sins. Yes, in the Sacrament the Lord gives us His body, which was given into death for our sins, offers, conveys, and seals unto us all the benefits and blessings which He procured for us by His death on the cross — forgiveness of sins, righteousness, life, and salvation. Thus the Lord, in instituting the Eucharist, ordained not only a memorial supper, but also a powerful *means of grace.*

(To be concluded.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

In quick succession death has terminated the long and successful labors of three of the most efficient workmen at the colleges of the Missouri Synod. On April 13 *Prof. Martin Luecke,* Director of Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Ind., passed away at the age of 66 years and almost 10 months after serving the school twenty-three years. On April 23 the grim reaper claimed *Dr. C. Huth,* for forty-five years the leading professor of Greek at Concordia College, Milwaukee, Wis. On April 26 *Dr. Th. Brohm, Sr.,* formerly Director of the Teachers' Seminary at Addison, Ill. (now Concordia Teachers' College at River Forest, Ill.), and until shortly before his death assistant professor at Concordia College, Oakland, Cal., was summoned. All three men, besides being scholars in their particular branches, were esteemed as able theologians. DAU.

The Concordia Bilingual Edition of the Bible, to which our readers have been introduced in the department of book reviews, is so remarkable an achievement of Concordia Publishing House and is proving so valuable an aid to intelligent and effectual Bible study that I trust to be forgiven by the readers of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY for recording the above sentiments also in this place. What a labor-saving device this book represents can be appreciated fully only by those who have had to work constantly with the "Authorized Version" and the "Old Luther Text," each contained in a separate volume, and, as in the case of the Psalms, with a different verse numeration. To put these two Bibles together, page for page, into one volume that is not too bulky and can be carried also in an ordinary traveler's grip, and, besides, to add a large amount of concordance, dictionary material, and Bible maps to the volume, was a genial conception, and the bookmakers of Concordia have carried out the idea in great style. DAU.

A letter of protest against the Federal Council of Churches is published by the *Moody Monthly* in its January issue. It reads as follows: —

"Rev. W. R. Dobyns, D. D.,
Pastor, . . . Presbyterian Church,
Birmingham, Ala.

"DEAR DR. DOBYNS: —

"I object strongly, as an elder in the Southern Presbyterian Church, to its having any constituent relation to the Federal Council of Churches and to its paying any money in support thereof out of its funds. These funds are subscribed by myself and other members of the Southern Presbyterian Church for the general causes of the Church — foreign missions, home missions, Sunday-school extension, publication and ministerial relief, and Christian education, and not for donations to outside bodies.

"I especially object to, and protest against, any relation with the Federal Council of Churches because that body is not based upon the sound Biblical basis on which the Southern Presbyterian and other evangelical churches stand, namely, the acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as the only infallible rule of faith and practise and the five tenets of faith which have been promulgated by the Northern Presbyterian Church as essential, but which are widely ignored or openly and contemptuously denied by some of the churches and many of the individuals who are active, and some of whom are prominent, in the Federal Council of Churches.

"The Federal Council, like the other propositions which it promoted, to wit, the Interchurch World Movement, does not depend upon the foundation laid down in Scriptures. 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid,' which is the atonement of Jesus Christ for the sins of men and the personal acceptance of that atonement by faith, coupled with repentance and followed by regeneration and the full acceptance of the apostolic doctrines. Instead of basing itself upon this foundation and looking to the reception of power as in the

Day of Pentecost, all the members of the Federal Council being of 'one mind,' it obviously and openly depends upon numbers to accomplish the results which can be obtained only by the Holy Spirit acting through those who receive Him.

"In other words, the tendency to-day over the entire world is to substitute the power of organized cooperation of men in doing men's works, to wit, sociological works, in which the teaching of the Scripture is utterly ignored or denied, to wit, 'that by the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified.' We see in England to-day the strong efforts to draw together the Anglican and the Roman Catholic churches. It is questionable whether the Anglican Church is not in a perilous condition as the result. I have myself heard in India, in Anglican church services, prayers for the dead in accordance with the Romish doctrine of purgatory. The spread of the confessional amongst Anglican churches is notorious.

"We see efforts made, as in the Congress of Religions at Chicago, to draw together Christians, Buddhists, Mohammedans, and Shintoists.

"Are not these ecclesiastic bodies which are seeking to get together trying to find the least common denominator, — in other words, to find what there is of doctrine that can be accepted by every religious body, no matter what its name, so that, in effect, to find something on which all these units may come together into a really heterogeneous, but nominally homogeneous body, one discards one element and another another, until there is nothing of value retained, and that which is left is nothing but a shadow or simulacrum?

"I dissent most strongly from this method of building up the living Church of Christ upon earth. 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' And again, 'What communion hath light with darkness, and what concord hath Christ with Belial?' And again, 'Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate.'

"As I understand it, the Church, *ecclesia,* is a body which is called out from the world for the express purpose of being witnesses to certain specific facts taught by Holy Scripture, and any organization which contains those who deny or ignore those facts, or the Scriptures which teach them, must be inherently unsound. In my own business of making steel we are required to take the utmost precaution and go to any amount of trouble and expense to obtain absolute homogeneity. If there is even the smallest percentage of foreign matter present in the steel, it reduces its tensile strength and soundness; so if there is the smallest admixture of error or untruth in a so-called Church or religious body, combination of churches, its efficiency is *pro tanto* reduced. It is not necessary, in dealing with the Federal Council of Churches, to do more than to look over the list of names of those who are prominent in its management and to look over the record of its proceedings to see that it does not and cannot measure up to the standard set by the Southern Presbyterian Church. The Federal Council of Churches would accept and work heartily with the New York Presbytery, the representatives of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, the University of Chicago, Brown

University, and such institutions from which are graduated into the ministry men who would not be permitted to occupy the pulpits of Southern Presbyterian churches or to be sent by the Southern Presbyterian mission board to the foreign fields to teach the principles of Christianity.

"How can we, therefore, consistently be, as a whole, a member of the Federal Council, and how can we with any propriety divert the funds of our members to its propaganda?

"Yours very truly,

"JAMES BOWRON."

Church Attendance. — The editor of the *Watchman-Examiner,* in the issue of February 18, presents quotations from letters which he has received from representative States in all parts of the Union on the question of decreasing or increasing church attendance. In general, the reports are optimistic, opining that attendance at church is keeping pace with the increasing population. A correspondent from Colorado, however, states that "in Colorado there is not more than a ten per cent. shrinkage in church attendance within ten years, and the shrinkage is due largely to the fact that children do not remain for the morning preaching service following the Sunday-school." Another State reports: "There seems to be a new attitude toward the Church and church services that is not at all encouraging. It is a sort of I-will-do-as-I-please attitude, regardless of the effect on the Church and upon one's personal life and character." Many of the writers lay their finger on the sore spot. "Where the decline occurred, the people wanted the simple truth as it was preached by our fathers, and the pastor was trying to put the work over by organization, popular subjects, social service, by giving the people current topics instead of showing them how to be saved." Again: "I sympathize with the sentiment that too many of our pastors and churches are grasping here and there for something to popularize and entertain the masses of the people, but these substitutes have not taken the place of the earnest teaching and preaching of the Word." Attendance at evening services is generally considered waning, for various reasons, such as afternoon outing protracted into the evening, counter-attractions, and rest. Emphasis is placed in the replies on the work of the pastor. "Where pastors . . . have cultivated, in the name of their constituency, the churchgoing habit, where they have steadily given a worth-while spiritual message, the product of real brain power and prayer, and where the pastoral function of the minister has not been forgotten, in such cases church attendance has not shown a decline. In general, I think we are warranted in asking the question, 'What is the matter with the ministers?' We cannot place the whole blame upon automobiles and Sunday movies nor even upon the Sunday newspapers." MUELLER.

Jesuit Quarterly. — Announcement has been made that, beginning with June, 1926, the Society of Jesus in the United States will publish a quarterly magazine, aiming to be a scholarly review of current thought as reflected by Catholic writers of note and learning.

It will be under the management of a board of editors. The editor-in-chief will be Wilfrid Parsons, editor of *America;* managing editor, F. P. Le Buffe, Dean of the School of Social Service, Fordham University; with associate editors for Theology, Philosophy, Sociology, History, Education, and Literature, the last being Rev. J. J. Daly, former Literary Editor of *America* and professor in St. Louis University. All are prominent Jesuits. The *Catholic World* for February states the proposed policy of the new magazine: "While abiding unreservedly by the tenets of the Catholic faith, the quarterly will endeavor, as is the wont of the Catholic Church, to present that faith as assimilative of all the true discovery and ever progressive in its attitude towards the problems that vex the world at large in every age. Indeed, it is the hope of the editors that this quarterly will contribute not a little to the whole movement of learning in this country." A study of the methods by which Jesuitism will align papal infallibility with hyperprogressive attitudes of our time — for that is evidently the object — should prove illuminating. History repeats itself. MUELLER.

On the Roman propaganda in the northern countries of Europe the *News Bulletin Service* of the National Lutheran Council has published an account by Prof. Carl Stange, Ph. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Goettingen. The account bears the title "The Journey of Cardinal van Rossum in the Scandinavian Countries." It was published in the *Zeitschrift fuer Systematische Theologie,* for the third quarter, 1925, and is here offered in an English translation prepared by Rev. P. A. Mattson, Ph. D., D. D., President of the Minnesota Conference of the Augustana Synod: —

"In 1923 Cardinal Wilhelm van Rossum of Holland, the Prefect of the Roman Propaganda, made a journey through the Northern Countries — ostensibly to visit the Catholic missions in the North. The cardinal had published a report concerning his trip in a newspaper in Holland, which in the mean time — with a few corrections — was translated into German. (*The Religious Situation at the Present Time,* No. 4: 'The Religious Condition of the Catholics in the North Countries, 1924.' With church imprint.)

"This report of the cardinal has already, in so far as it contains an opinion regarding the religious or church conditions in the North Countries, occasioned lively protest in those lands. One would, from this report, suppose the affair of the journey to be a closed book. But since the report of the tour has been brought to the attention of the German public, being indeed compiled for the purpose of propaganda, it is in the interest of Evangelical Christianity to analyze this peculiar document of religious culture by one of the highest dignitaries of the Catholic Church of the present day.

"In the friendly reception which was accorded him by officials and private citizens during his tour the cardinal has seen evidences of an approach to the Roman Church. His report to his countrymen in Holland proclaims triumphantly: The Protestantism of the North

Countries is in process of dissolution, and the North Countries are ripe for Catholicism. In rapturous expressions he speaks of the great result of Catholic church-work and especially of the deep impression which his appearance in person has made on the people of the North Countries. The cardinal has already been emphatically advised that he has misinterpreted the hospitality accorded him. It is generally known that the sense of hospitality among the Northern people is characteristic of them. This the cardinal has also experienced, but it would be rash if every traveler who has had this experience would draw the conclusion that the friendliness shown him is an acknowledgment of his business or the political or the religious group which he represents. In the North Countries opportunities to see dignitaries of the Catholic Church are infrequent. It is evidently for this reason that the appearance of a cardinal has made an impression in which curiosity and interest in the unusual and unfamiliar play a leading part. But from this it does not follow at all that the North Countries are ripe for Catholicism.

"From the standpoint of the Roman hierarchy it is easily understood that the honor to the cardinal's person could appear as a part of Catholic worship, since the Catholic hierarchy comprehends submission as an essential sign of piety. One cannot, therefore, explain the simple-mindedness with which he exhibits his own dignity and the importance with which he carefully records the honor which was shown his person as mere vanity. But it is just as absurd that the cardinal interprets this honor shown him by non-Catholics as a hierarchial mixture of the personal and the churchly.

"The members of the Lutheran Church who greeted the cardinal with esteem and respect evidently had no presentiment of the hierarchial background of his thoughts. They only knew that the cardinal wished to visit the scattered Catholics in the North Countries. This pastoral object of the journey could arouse among the Protestant people, so far as they were churchly-minded, reminiscences of the historical connections of both churches. They did not know that this pastoral object was only an external excuse for his journey and that the real intention of the cardinal was opposition to the Lutheran Church. They did not know that every little occurrence and every harmless word would, in the fancy of the cardinal, be beaten into a weapon against the Lutheran Church; else they would not have been tempted to draw the conclusion from the common possession of the name of Christ that even the smallest possible internal spiritual connection exists between the communions.

"The report of the journey which the cardinal rendered to his countrymen in Holland was clear enough in this respect, that the ambiguous intention of the journey was frankly expressed. This report of the journey should be distributed as widely as possible in the countries visited by the cardinal. Wherever Protestant sentiment is found, it would call forth opposition and indignation. It does not behoove this man, after receiving the hospitality and small personal honors which impressed him so, to exhibit such animosity to the Lutheran Church and its representatives. That he dares to say of

the Lutheran Church that it possesses no pure principles calls forth the sharpest criticism. But all that might be said of the cardinal himself is not to be compared with the shocking impression which this report of the spirit of Catholicism in one of its highest representatives produces.

"I next observe the narrowness of the horizon in which the historical judgment of the cardinal moves. One must, of course, also consider that the diplomacy of the cardinal allows him to say many things which evidently are intended to serve the object of propaganda. But the fact that a man standing at the head of Roman propagandism imagines that he can make an impression on Protestants with this sort of historic judgment shows what diminutive understanding of historic life manifests itself in an ecclesiastical prince of the highest rank. According to the cardinal the transition of the North Countries from Roman Catholicism to Lutheranism is exclusively to be attributed to the employment of force and tricks. The princes forced the people to apostasy from the Catholic Church after having themselves been deceived by the charges of its corruption on the part of the Lutheran preachers!

"The results of the Reformation are therefore entirely negative: the destruction of spiritual and material values. Before the Reformation the culture which the Catholic Church brought forth was a nursery of wisdom and a source of material prosperity. Through the Reformation all this is destroyed. Concerning the rôle which the Catholic bishops played in the Scandinavian countries at the time of the Reformation, concerning the violence and worldliness of the Catholic clergy, and concerning the uplifting influence which the Reformation exerted, the cardinal, self-evidently, is silent. If one should find such a view of history somewhere in an obscure writing of a Catholic chaplain, he would waste no words on it; but when a man who is chiefly responsible for the education of Roman missionaries thinks thus concerning the Reformation, it is astonishing indeed. What, then, will the cardinal's coreligionists in Holland say of him, since they are living in an overwhelmingly Protestant country and can at any moment convince themselves that their country, come forth victoriously out of the religious battles of the Reformation, compares favorably in a spiritual and material aspect with any country in the world?

"The cardinal evidently does not realize that in the four hundred years since the Reformation a new, a characteristic culture has arisen, which, under the influence of the Protestant spirit and in spite of all protests of Rome, has exerted a lasting influence on the Roman Church, so that its historical life since the time of the Reformation has exhausted itself chiefly in the warding off of this new, determined civilization of Protestantism. In this confessional struggle, it is, perhaps, not the deciding point, but one always worthy of note, that the Catholic Church thinks itself capable of taking the leadership of the nations, upon the mere presupposition that civilization must be turned back six hundred or seven hundred years, while the Evangelical Church stands as a rock in the middle of the stream of present-day spiritual development and determines its course and form.

"Whence is it that since the Reformation the Roman Church no longer enjoys the spiritual leadership of the nations and that the ratio of the number of adherents, in spite of the fact that the Roman Church used every political means at its disposal, is unfavorable to the latter as compared with the Protestant churches? Can it be proved from this that some wicked people with low morals have determined upon destroying the Church of Christ? Or is the cause of this not rather the fact that the Church of Rome, while it has hardened itself against the preaching of repentance by Luther, has lost inner spiritual life and thereby the power over the hearts of men?

"To what extent this emptiness and depreciation of religious life has won a following in the Roman Church may be gathered from the startling utterances of the cardinal in which he gives expression to his religious feelings. Outstanding in his report are the hierarchial glorification of his own person and the enumeration of relics to which he pays devotion. The relics of the holy Knute in Odense, the relics of the holy cross of Christ, and the most holy Virgin Mary of the Faroe Islands, the relics of St. Bridget of Sweden, and the relics of the blessed Henning of Finland were hunted up by the cardinal. To them he paid homage, humbled himself or knelt before them, paying devotions and addressing prayers to the saints. He knows that the Protestants repudiate the relic-worship of the Catholic Church, but that does not hinder him from holding fast to the worship of the bones of the dead and fixing upon this as the central theme of his piety. It is very characteristic of him and reveals the man's nature that he imagines the interest which the North Countries take in antique fragments of the past to be an approach to the Catholic faith.

"The Catholic faith is so closely linked with purely historical interest in the past that for the cardinal a visit to the museum becomes a source of edification. In the Protestant countries one is perhaps inclined to believe the Catholic theologians when they say that the relic-worship of the Catholic Church is a concession to the piety of the people and, consequently, is of but secondary significance. And it may also be that this kind of idolatry, where Catholicism finds itself associated with Protestantism, has been reduced and put into the background. But the cardinal's account of his travels shows that even a leader of highest rank in the Roman Church, the prefect of the Roman Propaganda, considers relic-worship an essential part of his piety. The sections in which the cardinal speaks of the relics closely follow the statement in which he speaks of the claims of the hierarchy, that part of the account of his journey in which alone he gives a warm and vivid expression to his sympathies. Of course, 'our Lord Jesus Christ' is occasionally mentioned, but not a word of His death or of His resurrection, still less the forgiveness of sins wrought by Him. Indeed, not once does the word 'sin' occur. 'Our Lord Jesus Christ' is mentioned only in order to give him an opportunity to speak of His alleged representative on earth, the Pope in Rome. And while he directs his prayers to St. Bridget and the Virgin Mary, no appeal is made to pray to Christ.

"Under such circumstances it sounds like irony when the cardinal occasionally, using Lutheran formulas, urges the readmission of Catholic worship in the Faroe Islands on the ground that here the Word of God should be preached freely and without hindrance. If the missionary efforts of the cardinal are to be directed to bringing the Lutheran countries nearer the Word of God, one would expect that he would seek to inform himself concerning the extent to which the Word of God is manifest in the life of these countries and in the piety of individuals, and to what extent the person of Jesus Christ determines the conscience of individuals and the message of Jesus and His apostles proves itself a consolation to them in life and death. If he had made inquiry in such a fashion, he probably would have seen that in the North Countries, under the influence of the spirit of the times, many have become estranged from the Gospel, but that, nevertheless, even to-day there is free access to the clear and pure Word of God throughout the Church of the Reformation. He would then, perhaps, have gained the impression that the Lutheran Church, in such sermons as are founded only on the confession of Christ, possesses a far greater treasure than the Catholic Church in its hierarchy and superstitious faith in relics. But evidently the cardinal has not seen anything of the Lutheran Church. He returns from his journey without having obtained a true understanding of Christianity, without in any way being touched in his conscience. He lacks every organ for apprehending the power of the Gospel, which transforms the heart of man.

"Although it is his life-work to direct the training of Roman missionaries appointed for work in the Protestant countries, he lacks the principal requirements for it and only approximates an understanding of the characteristic religious life of the people among whom he intends to inject the errors of the Pope's Church.

"What the cardinal understands by 'free and unhindered preaching of the Word of God' is reestablishment of the hierarchy and superstitious worship of relics. Both these caricatures of piety explain the entire scope of his Catholicism in so far as it expresses itself in the account of his travels. The Romanists claim to worship 'God in the Tabernacle,' *i. e.,* in the Mass. The piece of bread, which by the word of the priests is made God, represents their power equally as much as the materialism of superstition. Each, in the final analysis, is prompted by the same motive, the deification of the material. The priest becomes God — that is necessary in order that the priests in Rome and all their subjects may exercise their lordship over the people. And the bread is turned into God — that is necessary in order that through the visible and palpable presence of the Deity the indispensability of the visible and palpable Church may be brought into consciousness for the salvation of the believers.

"The cardinal, of course, made the observation that the adherents of the Lutheran Church permit themselves to be greatly impressed by the esthetic pomp and glory of the Catholic Mass and by the unified organization of the Catholic Church. On account of this he does not neglect to point out the simplicity and the poverty of

Lutheran worship and the divisions within the Lutheran Church. And in this very argument the reason is found for most 'conversions' to the Catholic Church. There will always be people who are peculiarly receptive to sentiment, who will confuse the impression which the mystical and secretive Catholic worship makes on the senses with being touched by the divine. And likewise there will be people who lack the necessary stamina to make a personal decision and on this account require an authority which will relieve them of sorrows for the soul's welfare and the struggles and distresses of the inner life. But such cases do not decide the destiny of the two churches and cannot render a decision of the worth of either.

"The great unity of the Roman Church is only a seeming one. It is only attained because that Church is satisfied with outward submission and in other things permits opposing religious opinions. It is consequently exposed, just as the Lutheran Church, to internal conflicts. But the internal conflicts are covered up from time to time and made harmless through the decrees of the hierarchy. The unity of the Roman Church is, in fact, protected by the hierarchy. Without the strong pressure which the hierarchy exercises, the component parts of Catholicism would soon dissolve and show what they really are — a demoralization of Christianity. The Evangelical Church, however, although in general it refrains from claiming external unity, in its preaching of justification alone through faith in Christ extends inner unity beyond the bounds of individual nations and social distinctions and differences. The Evangelical Church can permit the greatest diversity in external organization, in constitution, in worship, and even in the development of social life, because it treats exclusively of the purpose of all Christian life, the communion of the individual human heart with God, who has revealed Himself throughout the history of mankind.

"In regard to Catholicism, its preference consists in this — which constitutes the religious distinction of Christianity with reference to all other religions, — that it emphasizes the pure personal experience of communion with God on the basis of God's revelation of Himself, which is the starting-point, center, and goal of religious life. It holds the nature of Christianity to be a message of salvation from the Son of God, in spite of all diplomatic and political tricks of the Catholic Church, and on this account has the certain guarantee of victory. For in the controversies of the Christian confessions the worldly cunning of the imperious hierarchy does not determine the outcome, but the power and maturity of the living faith in God.

"For this reason it is only an inadequate substitute that the Catholic Church emphasizes the esthetic accessories of its divine worship and deludes the people through the emptiness and deterioration of the inner life. Those who solely depend on form of worship confuse the excitement of the senses with a practical proof of the inner life. The stimulation of the senses can for a moment move us deeply and for a time probably also arouse in us a delusion regarding the real significance of man's existence. But no mere

excitement of the senses can change our will and give our life a new direction and a new content. The transformation of our will comes to pass only when through the preaching of the Gospel we learn to know the will of God. In relation to it we must learn to acknowledge the inability and the corruptness of our own will. Our life is not composed of sentimentality alone, but is a problem which places upon us a responsibility. Sentimentality passes away, and when it is gone, we find ourselves in the same condition in which we were before.

"The Gospel cheers us so that our entire life becomes new. If we wish to commune with God, we must come with a pure heart. It is, therefore, generally correct when the Evangelical Church keeps esthetical sentiments in the background. The danger is ever present that these sentimentalities will lead us away from the principal thing and weaken the earnestness of the decision which Christianity demands. If it is only a question of sentiment, then the substance of religion is unimportant. In heathen worship there are also impressive ceremonies. Whoever, then, will introduce the purely impressive will, because of it, always mix Christianity with heathen piety. In the strife of the Christian confessions everything will depend upon the recognition and preservation of the peculiarities of Christianity as distinct from all heathen piety, and in this sense the Word of God must be taught in truth and purity.

"Contrary to the cardinal's expectations, the account of his travels, in which he thinks he is able to proclaim to his fellow-believers in Holland the triumph of Roman Catholicism in the North Countries, has become a testimony against Catholicism. The Catholic Church can scarcely compromise itself more strongly than it does through the spiritual and religious narrowness of this prefect of Roman Propaganda. The want of consideration with which he misuses the confidence placed in him and the brazenness with which he claims as the highest aim of all Catholic propaganda (especially of the charity work in the Catholic hospitals) the subjugation of all under the Roman hierarchy, will open the eyes of Evangelical Christians in the North Countries and render them conscious of the fact that in the transactions of Catholics with Protestants the simple and self-evident demands of the conscience have no significance. The insincerity of the Catholics toward Evangelical Christians is to them a religious duty. And the *naiveté* with which the cardinal intends to replace the Gospel of Jesus Christ with his inferior piety — his worship of bones and saints and the deifying of the priests — clearly proves that the Roman Church has not changed its character, but to-day, perhaps still more than in the time of Luther, has ceased to be the Church of Jesus Christ. The Catholics are quite right that to them the Pope is the representative of Jesus Christ. Their error consists only in this, that they do not observe how just in this formula the entire corruption of the Roman Church finds expression."

It is to be hoped that the Lutherans in Northern Europe who showed respect to a Roman cardinal — and, for that matter, other Lutherans elsewhere — have learned a wholesome lesson. DAU.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — "The word for 'servants' (Rev. 22, 3) is 'bondmen'; but the term 'to do him service' means also 'worship.' Bondage finds its euthanasia in love. So 'service' is 'perfect freedom.' There is no idleness in the last leisure of the saints, but there is no task either; its work is worship. So pleasure is bliss." (C. Ryder Smith, in *The Bible Doctrine of Wealth and Work.*) Reminds one of passages in Luther's *Liberty of a Christian Man.*

Of the relentless *exposé* of Dr. Fosdick's teachings by Dr. Haldeman, of the First Baptist Church, New York, S. G. Craig says in the *Princeton Theological Review:* "Dr. Haldeman writes as one who is concerned for souls, and he is intense in his opposition to the teachings of Dr. Fosdick because he believes those teachings are leading men to put their trust in an ethical rather than a saving Christ, because they 'repudiate the Bible doctrine of the way of salvation through a penally sacrificial and blood-redeeming Christ.' Dr. Haldeman has no trouble in showing that the Christ whom Dr. Fosdick preaches is not the Christ of the New Testament at all. He shows that Dr. Fosdick's Christ lacks omnipotence, that he is 'subject to the interpretation of the modern mind,' that his 'history has been largely invented,' that his 'supreme claims are fiction,' that his 'miracles were never performed.' He shows, moreover, that, according to Dr. Fosdick, the Bible is a book which is 'contradicted by science, unreliable in history, not always moral, and whose shifting thought-forms, whose uncertain "frame work" make it of avail only as it can be proved by personal experience.' There is nothing of the Laodicean about Dr. Haldeman." One only wonders what there is modern about Fosdick. His genealogy reaches back to Marcion. Surely this age of ours does not read history. Any old chestnut can be palmed off on it as "modern."

Dr. Zwemer, in a recent work, shows that the "law of apostasy" in Mohammedanism must necessarily make that religion forever intolerant of Christianity. Reviewing Dr. Zwemer's book, O. T. Allis remarks in the *Princeton Theological Review:* "In view of the attempts which are being so frequently made to-day to correlate all of the religions of mankind on the theory that they are all the expression of the same universal human impulse, differing in value only because of the varying culture, development, and peculiar gifts of the various nations of the world, it is well that we should have our attention called to the fact so plainly taught in the Scriptures and abundantly confirmed by the history of Christian missions that Christianity is not one of the many ethnic religions, but a religion which makes exclusive and paramount claims for itself, claims which have found nowhere more emphatic denial or more bitter opposition than in the religion of the false prophet." And yet some Christians in America parade our streets in their lodge uniform borrowed from the people of the false prophet.

At a dinner, on February 28, at Hotel Astor religious intolerance, racial hatred, and group strife were buried under an avalanche of oratory by Charles Evans Hughes, Dr. Cyrus Adler of the "orthodox" and Mrs. Alexander Kohut of the "reformed" Jews, and Dr. Cadman. "The preparation and handling of the food was supervised by two orthodox rabbis." The only people at this affair who still revealed some respect for conscience were the orthodox Jews, and theirs was an erring conscience.

Dr. William Pierson Merrill, whose book *Liberal Christianity* is the reply of the Presbyterian Modernists to Dr. Machen's *Christianity and Liberalism*, has been read out of the Presbyterian Church by his reviewer in the *Princeton Theological Review*, Floyd E. Hamilton. He deserves it.

By the Stanford Reading Test, Carleton Washburne and Mabel Vogel of the Winnetka, Ill., public schools, have determined which books children really like best. They have a report on their work in the *Journal of the National Education Association* (Washington), and the American Library Association has published their list as the "Winnetka Graded Book List." The list shows that children, just like their seniors, like a good deal of trash. What else could be expected?

According to Raymond Savage's book *Allenby of Armageddon* the prophetic conflict has already taken place, *viz.*, when Lord Allenby took Jerusalem and conquered the Turks. Few people would have believed that Armageddon would be such a comparatively pleasant affair. And now we all missed watching it. Too bad!

The "intimate record" which Ralph Deakin, through the Lippincott Company, has published of the "triumphal journey" of the Prince of Wales depicts the marvelous royal fox-trotter as "the greatest salesman of the world." He has been "selling" the British Empire in the British colonies and the Americas.

Dr. Fosdick conducts the "Religion and Life" Department in *Harper's Magazine.* In the March number he has an article on "The Dangers of Modernism" (*sic!*) in which he complains about the "notorious spiritual aridity" of his followers. He speaks of Modernists "so anxious to be rational that they forget to be religious," and "who, in desperately trying to be modern, forget what religion is all about." He quotes approvingly the summing up by an American Liberal of the present situation as "a division between arid Liberalism and acrid Liberalism." The drift of his complaint is that Modernism is only negative and destructive, but shows no sign of becoming creative and producing positive results. Here the astonished Frenchman's "*Que voulez-vous, monsieur!*" is in order. Is it reasonable to expect a harvest of grapes from a crop of thistles?

American and British universities and colleges are conditioning participation in student athletics on the part of athletes upon satisfactory grades in all their subjects. The slogan has been given out that the "primary object of a college is to train minds." Only in so far as a sound mind requires a sound body to dwell in, are athletics to be favored: they are to exhibit a combination of brawn and brain. President Lowell of Harvard has retracted his denunciation of college athletes as "dollish creatures."

The movement in behalf of better educational facilities started by Governor Aycock of North Carolina has spread to every State in the Southeast. In 1902 these States raised by taxation and paid for public schools $27,270,310; in 1924 they raised and spent $273,036,452. The school terms have been lengthened from four and five months a year to eight and nine months.

The articles in the *National Geographic Magazine* for May on the new North Carolina, which is coming to the front among Southeastern States, also the article on South Carolina, furnished most interesting reading-matter. It will be well for us to keep our eyes on the Southeast where great changes are taking place. The new Southeast can be seen anywhere south of a line drawn from Washington, D. C., to Asheville, N. C. DAU.

BOOK REVIEW.

Minutes of the Twenty-Ninth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America. 75 pages. 50 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

These printed minutes contain a German essay by Prof. M. S. Sommer on "The Unity of the Christian Church" and an extensive report on the work of the Synodical Conference among the colored people of our country. The officers of the Synodical Conference are: The Rev. C. Gausewitz, president; Prof. L. Fuerbringer, D. D., vice-president; the Rev. H. M. Zorn, secretary; the Rev. E. Eckhardt, statistician; Mr. Albert Gruett, treasurer.

FRITZ.

Five Minutes Daily with Luther. By *John T. Mueller.* 375 pages, 4½×8½. $2.50. (The Macmillan Co., New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This new book of devotion by our colleague Prof. J. T. Mueller deserves to be used in the homes of our Christian people. The compiler has done our lay people a valuable service in making accessible to them in a small volume a few of the gems from Luther's voluminous writings. One page is devoted to each daily lesson. A short Scripture-passage is placed at the head, which is followed by an exposition taken from Luther and by a verse from Christian hymnology. In his preface, Professor Mueller calls attention to an additional purpose which the book may serve. He says: "While the book has been designed primarily for devotional reading and has therefore been arranged in daily lessons, it may be used also as a reference work on Luther's principal teachings. Such a reference work may be desirable. For this reason two indexes were added, a subject index and an index for the passages treated." FRITZ.

Refuge and Strength. Seven-minute Talks Delivered at Daily Convocation. Compiled and edited by *Otto Mees, D. D.* 206 pages, 5¼×7¾. $1.00. (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

In the foreword to this book the compiler and editor, Prof. Otto Mees, president of Capital University of the Ohio Synod, says: "On each school-day, between the hours of ten thirty and ten forty-five, the students of Capital University assemble in the college chapel for a brief devotion. The president, faculty members, and neighboring pastors, in turn, address the assembly. For fifteen minutes the students are led to abandon their academic pursuits in order to worship God with song and prayer. This is as it should be in a Christian college. The purpose of the addresses is twofold. It is to awaken or to keep alive in the minds of our students the consciousness that, while intellectual growth is fostered, spiritual development must not be neglected. It is also to direct and assist the young people to translate their faith into life." The forty short addresses treat the following general subjects: Life, Habits, Character Building, Service, God's Gifts, Prayer, Church, Christian Characteristics. The addresses which we have read are excellent, both as to contents and presentation. We do not understand why the following paragraph in an address on "Are You Ashamed of Your Church?" was permitted to be printed: "We need not be ashamed of her divisions, lamentable and deplorable as this feature of our Church is, since her divisions are an evidence that Lutherans love nothing of this world so much as the truth and are ever ready to contend earnestly for the faith." The addresses given in this book will make profitable reading also for our young people. FRITZ.

An Introduction to the Principles of Religious Education. By *Earle Edward Emme* and *Paul Raymond Stevick.* 286 pages. (The Macmillan Co., New York.)

The value of this publication lies in the opportunity which it affords for studying the effect of applying modern scientific methods to religious education. The concept of human nature in an age when everything is

changing has also undergone a change. The old creedal religion is declared defunct. Accordingly new aims have to be fixed, and a new pedagogical apparatus has to be constructed for making education in religion effective to the twentieth century Illuminati. Just why this should be so is not plain. I can fly from St. Louis to Chicago in a few hours, — something that my father could not do, — but what my father and my Christian teachers taught me about sin, for instance, about conceit and pride, is just as true to-day as when I was a boy. And from the bad conscience that results from sinning there is no remedy except the old fogy home remedy: Repent and believe in God's forgiveness of your sin for the Redeemer's sake. Will not somebody come forward and depict for us exactly what scientific remorse, worthy of an up-to-date lady or gentleman of culture, is like, and write out a scientific formula of absolution that will stand any test in a psychological laboratory? DAU.

Jesus of Nazareth. His Life, Times, and Teaching. By *Joseph Klausner, Ph. D.* 434 pages.

The Aim of Jesus Christ. By *W. F. Cooley, Ph. D.* 227 pages. (Both publications of the Macmillan Co., New York.)

The Story of Jesus. By *M. H. Fischer, Ph. D.* 174 pages. (The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia.)

The first of these treatises, by one of the acknowledged leaders in Zionism, has been made accessible to English readers by Herbert Danby, D. D., residentiary canon of St. George's Cathedral Church, Jerusalem. The author works in scholarly fashion with Talmudic and rabbinical sources. To him Jesus is Jesus the Jew, and his aim is to show how Jewry made Jesus, and what contribution Jesus made to Judaism. Surely a thankless task in view of the fact that the teaching of Jesus had to go beyond the confines of Jewry to get a proper hearing in the world and to achieve its saving mission. — In the second treatise the instructor in philosophy in Columbia University constructs what he terms "the original Christ figure in the palimpsest of the New Testament." His Christ is the Christ of Higher Criticism, who pursues ethical aims, rather than a vicarious atonement for the redemption of sinners. These ethical aims make Him valuable for the solution of modern problems of civilization and for pointing the Church to its real mission and duty in the present age. This Christ is a scientific myth of modern times. — Dr. Fischer's book is designed as a text-book for classes in Christian training-schools. With its outlines of subjects and its suggestions for further study and for review work it meets this aim very well. DAU.

Our Lord's Earthly Life. By *Rev. Prof. David Smith, M. A., D. D.* 500 pages, 8×5½. $3.00. (Doran Co., New York.)

There are, above all, three features that must endear this Life of Christ to the reader, namely, mature scholarship, a believing and reverent spirit, and accuracy in depicting the glorious and perfect life of our Lord. The language is chaste and dignified, and the narrative is written without any attempt to minimize the miraculous. Little effort is spent on doctrinal discussion, and this is perhaps the chief fault which the reader will find with the book; for the Savior's Word can never be sepa-

rated from His work. The author is weakest in depicting the *magna passio* of the Lord, and in his resurrection account the sublime truths underlying that miraculous event are lost in a maze of what often seems to the reviewer irrelevant explanation. There is but one true and adequate account of Christ's life and death, namely, that of the inspired gospels, which holy men of God wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. No Life of Christ has ever reached the sublimity of the holy gospels.

MUELLER.

Do Fundamentalists Play Fair? By *W. M. Forrest.* 125 pages. (The Macmillan Co., New York.)

The Professor of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Virginia has observed the tactics pursued by Fundamentalists in their polemics against Modernists and is convinced that they lack candor. A book like this was to be expected, and I expect more of this kind to follow. For it is a fact that Fundamentalists are not, each of them, one hundred per cent. genuine and sincere defenders of the inerrant Scriptures. But the author is mistaken, I think, when he believes that he has no quarrel with Fundamentalism itself, but only with the methods of some Fundamentalists.

DAU.

The Religious Education of the Child. By *Samuel A. Stein, M.A., D.D.* 39 pages, 9×6. 25 cts.

Lakeside Lectures on the Gospel Ministry. By *H. J. Schuh, D.D.* Reprinted from *Teologisk Tidsskrift.* 24 pages, 9×6. 20 cts. (Both: Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.)

The Lutheran Book Concern offers to the reading public two more tracts of vital interest, both timely and worthy of careful reading. In *The Religious Education of the Child* Dr. S. A. Stein (Ohio Synod), favorably known as author of *A Guide in Church Finance*, presents with remarkable preciseness and vigor the need, province, and method of the Christian training of the young. The need of Christian training is apparent, but the state cannot provide for it; hence Christian parents and the Christian churches must shoulder the responsibility and utilize every available avenue by which the child may be reached. The ways in which this can be done are specified in the last chapter. The tract is an ardent plea for more and better Christian education. — The *Lakeside Lectures on the Gospel Ministry* picture the Christian minister as preacher, teacher, pastor, business manager, and as a pattern to all men in the exercise of Christian virtues. In simple, direct language Dr. Schuh presents the lofty ideal of a true pastor after the heart of God. We are sure that no pastor will regret the study of this tract.

MUELLER.

The First Age of Christianity. By *Ernest F. Scott.* 242 pages, 7½×5. $1.50. (Macmillan Co., New York.)

This book is designed to furnish to the student of the New Testament a background by means of which he may view Christianity in its real essence, both as doctrine and as a dynamic. Christianity, according to the author, is a blending of Judaistic thought with Hellenistic, Alexandrian, and mystical speculation. It was Paul especially who forged these heterogeneous elements into a unified system of faith, with the message of the

Cross the pivotal point. But Paul, John, and their coworkers were but "seekers after truth," and they "would have been the first to acknowledge that they had 'not yet apprehended'" (p. 238). They wished to "bequeath to us, not a finished scheme of doctrine, but their own spirit of tireless seeking." A book written from a viewpoint so utterly in opposition to the real facts in the case will be of little service in helping the student of the Bible to understand what Christianity is. It obscures rather than clarifies; historically as well as doctrinally it is a perversion which it features.

MUELLER.

The Purpose of God. By *C. C. Taylor, A. M., B. D.* 294 pages, 7½×5. $1.75. (Standard Publishing Co., Cincinnati, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

"The purpose of God," which the author has rightly traced in the Old Testament, is the sending of the divine Savior. This purpose the writer summarizes as follows: "Toward this end, that of bringing His Son into the world as Redeemer, God chose Abraham to head a people, or nation, who shall furnish the necessary religious setting or background for such an important event. Then we see that the immediate purpose of God as made known in the Old Testament is to arrange for the coming of Christ into the world. He was to be the center of all history. Everything, therefore, before Him was but pointing the way to Him, as that which has followed points back to Him as the great mountain peak of all history." (p. 293.) The book is a helpful apologetic against evolution and higher criticism. The chapter on "Criticism" is an unanswerable indictment of the folly of higher criticism.

MUELLER.

The International Critical Commentary. *The Pastoral Epistles*, by the *Rev. Walter Lock, D. D.* *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, by *James Moffat, D. D.* XLIV and 163 pages; LXXVI and 264 pages, 8×5. $3.00 and $3.50. (Scribner's, New York.)

To all who know and use the *International Critical Commentary* these two volumes, commentaries on some of the most important epistles in the New Testament, will certainly be welcome. The general character of the *International Critical Commentary* is well known. The work is of interest mainly to the specialist in Biblical science, to whom it offers scholarly criticism of the text, abundant quotations of parallel passages from profane literature, a wealth of archeological and historical lore, and a grammatical and linguistic apparatus, which the student will hardly find in any other commentary in a form so clear and attractive. Yet the *International Critical Commentary* has many faults, and also in these two volumes the conservative Bible student will find much to condemn. The commentators are men of liberal religious views, who recognize neither the verbal inspiration of the Bible nor the deity of Him of whom all Scriptures testify. The consequences of this liberal and often strikingly unfair treatment of the sacred text are noticeable on every page. Thus Dr. Moffatt regards the Epistle to the Hebrews as a Christian homily steeped in the speculations of allegorizing Alexandrian philosophy, in which Christ's sacrifice is nothing more than a symbolic vehicle of religious truth. Dr. Lock presents the arguments for and against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles very temperately, but leaves the conclusion to the

judgment of the reader. It is regrettable that in both volumes the real exegetic material, which, after all, is the first thing that the student of exegesis seeks in a commentary, is not sufficiently exhaustive. The important exegetic details are not treated with satisfactory fulness.

MUELLER.

Peloubet's Bible Dictionary. Based upon the foundation laid by *William Smith;* edited and brought up to date by *F. N. Peloubet, D. D.;* assisted by *Alice D. Adams, M. A.* 799 pages and maps. 9×5½. $2.50. (John C. Winston Co., Philadelphia.)

The purpose of this new *Bible Dictionary* is "to bring to the great body of our Sunday-school teachers and intelligent Christian households a Bible dictionary fully abreast of the latest modern scholarship, giving them the things which will most aid them in their work, but omitting long discussions and theories." In the simplest language it gives a full exposition of all topics mentioned in the Bible — every place, nation, tribe, person, and historical event; every custom and rite; every instrument and implement; every animal, plant, flower, mineral, metal, etc. It contains tables of money, weights, and measures, chronological tables (Ussher's, those of the Assyrian Eponym Canon, Beecher's); many new and helpful maps; also new pictures and several plans, which make the description more attractive and vivid. On the whole, the religious views set forth are conservative, although quite often the author departs from traditional orthodox views. In the treatment of the doctrinal questions the Reformed opinions are adhered to. Thus Baptism is described as "the public profession of faith and discipleship" (p. 73). The Lord's Supper is "a reminder of the leading truths of the Gospel" (p. 369). In spite of these and other faults this *Bible Dictionary* may be used with profit by those who are able to discriminate. MUELLER.

Facts of Our Faith. Teachings and Practises of the Church. By *William Lee Hunton.* 143 pages, 5×7½. $1.00. (The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.)

This book contains fifty-eight brief essays, giving simple statements of Christian faith and practise. Brevity is a good qualification of any writer or speaker. We are not sure, however, that the author has said just what he meant in the following sentence: "The Lutheran recognizes the right of private judgment and accords the right to make a personal interpretation and application of truth." We must distinguish between the right of private judgment and the assumed right of private interpretation.

FRITZ.

Foundations of Faith. A Manual of Christian Evidences. By *George Albert Getty, D. D.* 91 pages, 5×7½. 60 cts. (The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a primer of Christian apologetics for the common man. The ontological, cosmological, teleological, and moral arguments for the existence of God are presented; external and internal evidences are given to show that the Bible is the Word of God; and the teachings, the miracles, the resurrection, and the influence of Christ are cited as reasons for the belief that Jesus is true God. The book closes with a chapter showing

that the crowning evidence for the truth of the Christian religion is the personal experience of a Christian. — Under evidences in favor of the Bible we failed to find the fact mentioned that the Bible is the only religious book which teaches salvation by grace, while all the religious books of man teach salvation by works. There is only one reasonable explanation for this, namely, that the Bible doctrine of grace is a divinely revealed doctrine, while the religion of works is the religion of natural man.

FRITZ.

Science and Religion. By *J. A. Thompson, M. A., LL. D.* 280 pages.

Religious Experience and Scientific Method. By *H. N. Wiemann, Ph. D.* 387 pages.

Now I Know. By *J. A. MacCallum.* 164 pages.

The first of these publications comes from the press of Scribner's Sons and represents the Morse Lectures for 1924. The author's aim is "to show with concreteness and circumstantiality that modern scientific formulation in terms of the Lowest Common Denominators cannot be regarded as antithetic to religious interpretation in terms of the Greatest Common Measure." I believe that the chief help which this book can furnish is by curbing the arrogant claims of modern science. As regards the synthesis which it seeks between revealed religion and modern science, that is a futile effort. — The last two publications come from the prolific Macmillan press. Dr. Wiemann seeks to preserve for religion "intellectual standing" in our questioning age. Unless religion, he holds, plants itself firmly on the data of sense, it will turn into sentimentalism. This is an unhappy wording for an otherwise respectable fact. Religion cannot deal merely with mystic and enthusiastic notions, the creatures of men's minds, but must rest on external facts. But these facts, now, must be the facts which God by His revelation purveys to the mind of man. — Rev. MacCallum has given up all hope that men will ever again be found believing Genesis. He therefore undertakes to present Christianity "as a vitalizing experience rather than a series of propositions which must be accepted without question." The trouble will only be how to authenticate the experiences, otherwise they will not be vitalizing. Somewhere man is always confronted with an authority to which he simply must bow — or turn devil. DAU.

Soul-Winning Sermons. By *R. A. Torrey, D. D.* 485 pages, 8½×6. $4.00. (Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a most interesting collection of striking sermons, which, as the author states, "God has used in saving myriads of sinners all around the globe." There are two features which make these sermons different from the many thousands of sermons that are published annually outside of our Church; namely, 1. Dr. Torrey, the well-known evangelist, in the main, still preaches the basic facts of sin and grace; 2. he preaches them in a language which is simple and clear, but at the same time powerful and convincing in its direct appeal. Some of the topics are: "Three Reasons Why I Believe the Bible to Be the Word of God"; "Hell: Its Certainty and What Sort of a Place It Is"; "Every Man's Need of a Refuge"; "The Way of Salvation Made as Plain as Day," etc. The Sermons do not follow conventional forms; sometimes they might be classed as lectures rather than sermons; nor are they always sound in doctrine. Dr. Torrey is a Cal-

vinist, and in spite of many fine statements to the contrary he does not hold the Scriptural doctrine concerning the efficacy of the means of grace, the person of Christ, etc. Nevertheless, after careful perusal we recommend this collection of striking sermons to our pastors, not for imitation, but for analysis and private study, as samples of the better preaching outside of our circles. MUELLER.

False Prophets. By *James M. Gillis, C. S. P.* 201 pages. (The Macmillan Co., New York.)

One must overlook that the writer is one of the Paulist Fathers, that he believes in the seven sacraments of his Church, the worship of Mary, the sovereign authority of the Pope, etc., and simply follow his keen and witty dissection of such cheats as George Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Sigmund Freud, Conan Doyle, Friedrich Nietzsche, Ernst Haeckel, Anatole France, — and one will be delighted and heartened by this book. (One regrets to find Mark Twain among the "false prophets.") The last two chapters, "The Revival of Paganism" and "Back to Christ — or Chaos," are a truthful horoscope of our times. It is a pity that a Romanist must tell these things to Protestants about men who have mostly come out of their own Church. In the background of all looms the thought: To avoid chaos, the world must come back under the sheltering wings of the Pope. DAU.

The Life of William Jennings Bryan. By *Genevieve Forbes Herrick* and *John Origen Herrick.* 424 pages, 8½×6. (Buxton.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

"I have been a child of fortune from my birth. God gave me into the keeping of a Christian father and a Christian mother. They implanted in my heart the ideals that guided my life." So Wm. Bryan said at the end of his third presidential campaign, on the eve of election day, in a speech to his neighbors. Also in this election he lost out, but as a good loser he declared, "I shall find private life so full of joy that I shall not miss the Presidency." The principal joy, as appears from the biography before us, of Bryan's life was his religion, and especially his testimony on behalf of Christ, the divine Savior of the world, his last great effort being the defense of religion against Evolution. Shortly before his end he wrote in his "Last Will and Testament": "Trusting for my salvation to the blood of Jesus Christ, my Lord and Redeemer, and relying on His promise for my hope of resurrection, I consign my body to the dust and commend my spirit to the God who gave it." A Lutheran Christian can certainly not commend every act in the religious life, or every teaching in the faith, of Bryan. He was a member of several secret societies, though from the biography it would appear that he never took active interest in lodgery. In the cruel examination to which basphemous Darrow put him at the Dayton Trial he denied certain facts concerning the creation report which a true Lutheran Christian is convinced must be maintained. Nevertheless, in spite of all these failings, Bryan at all times believed and confessed the central truth of salvation by grace through faith. He died as a believing Christian. The Herricks' biography will greatly aid the reader in understanding the ideals of this singular, yet great man. It is interestingly written and offers copious quotations from Bryan's speeches and writings. MUELLER.